



PATENT APPLICATION

#4
8/19/03
mel

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Randall R. Wandmacher.
Serial No. 10/056,569
Filing Date: January 25, 2002

Examiner: Daniel L. Greene
Art Group: 3621
Docket No. 33836.00.0003

**Title: ESTABLISHMENT OF PREFERRED BUSINESS PARTNERS
USING A VENDOR CERTIFICATION PROGRAM**

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Attn: Examiner Daniel L. Greene

Certificate of First Class Mailing

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Comm. for Patents, U.S. Patent & Trademark Office, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this date.

08/06/03
Date

Karenina Oliver
Karenina Oliver

RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

In the Office Action mailed July 7, 2003, claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aycock et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,765,128,

hereafter "Aycock"). The Examiner claims that Aycock shows the claimed invention "except for providing the certification program on a fee basis." The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Aycock does not show or suggest a "curriculum" delivered via a communication network for a fee. In particular, line 3 of independent claim 1 reads in pertinent part:

"providing a vendor certification program comprising a curriculum...."

(Emphasis added.)

The Funk & Wagnalls New International Dictionary, copyright 1984 defines the noun "curriculum" as "a regular or particular course of study, as in a college."

RECEIVED
AUG 12 2003
GROUP 3600

Paragraph 18 of the specification includes a definition of a "curriculum" as "one or more course comprising material that is to be mastered by the students and one or more tests used to gauge the proficiency of...students as the take the course."

Where in Aycock is there any suggestion or teaching to deliver a course of study? Where in Aycock is there any teaching to deliver material to be mastered by students? In rejecting the claims under Aycock, the Examiner has ignored as least the "curriculum" limitation. None of the pending claims are obvious. They should all be allowed.

Independent claim 2 recites a computer-readable medium storing computer-executable instructions that implement the method of claim 1. Independent claim 9 recites a method, the first step of which states that "the vendor certification program comprises a curriculum...." Independent claim 10 recites a computer-readable medium storing computer-executable instructions that implement the method of claim 10. Independent claim 16 recites an apparatus; a memory device in the claimed apparatus stores a program that causes the claimed processor to "provide a vendor certification program comprising a curriculum...." Independent claim 22 recites a system that includes "at least one database...comprising a curriculum...." Independent claim 29 recites an apparatus; a memory device in the claimed apparatus stores a program that causes the claimed processor to "receive a curriculum...."


All of the corresponding dependent claims claim additional patentable subject matter.

Unless the Examiner can find all of the pending claim limitation in the prior art, the claims should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 6, 2003

By:


Joseph P. Krause
Reg. No. 32,578

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Telephone: (312) 609-7536
Facsimile: (312) 609-5005